



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/492,178      | 01/27/2000  | Joseph S. Hayden     | SGT-39              | 9549             |

23599 7590 09/26/2003

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.  
SUITE 1400  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

JACKSON, CORNELIUS H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2828

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 09/492178     |             |                       |                     |

| EXAMINER |              |
|----------|--------------|
| JACKSON  |              |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2828     | 16           |

DATE MAILED:

## EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul Ip (3) John Sopp  
(2) Cornelius Jackson (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of interview 9/25/03Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_Agreement  was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question.  was not reached.Claims discussed: 1, 8, 12, 16, 17 and 18

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph issues and the art rejections. Examiners pointed out claims 1, 8, 12, 16, 17 and 18 fail to clearly define the invention. Applicant is suggested to rewrite the claims in such a clear manner to comply with 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph for reconsideration. Applicant is suggested to provide a drawing with the changes in the wrapside fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. (With

Unless the paragraphs below have been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action.

Paul Ip  
Examiner's Signature

SP82828